

# United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/721,878	11/26/2003	Hiroshi Nakamoto	NAKA3010/EM	6011	
23364 7	590 . 12/06/2006		EXAM	EXAMINER	
BACON & THOMAS, PLLC			TILL, TERRENCE R		
625 SLATERS FOURTH FLO	<del></del>		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
ALEXANDRIA	A, VA 22314		1744		
			DATE MAILED: 12/06/2006	5	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	•		1
	Application No.	Applicant(s)	_
	10/721,878	NAKAMOTO ET AL.	•
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Terrence R. Till	1744	
The MAILING DATE of this communication Period for Reply	appears on the cover sheet wit	h the correspondence address	
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REWHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory per  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by state Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the material patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUNIC R 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a re- tiod will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONT butte, cause the application to become ABA	ATION.  ply be timely filed  "HS from the mailing date of this communication.  ANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status			
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on			
	his action is non-final.		
<ol> <li>Since this application is in condition for allow closed in accordance with the practice under</li> </ol>	·		
closed in accordance with the practice unde	Ex parte Quayle, 1999 G.D.	11, 400 0.0. 210.	
Disposition of Claims			
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-15</u> is/are pending in the applicati			
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are without the state of the state	drawn from consideration.		
5) Claim(s) <u>12-14</u> is/are allowed.			
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-11 and 15</u> is/are rejected. 7)□ Claim(s) is/are objected to.			
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and	d/or election requirement.	•	
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	•		
Application Papers			
9) The specification is objected to by the Exam			
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) a			
Applicant may not request that any objection to t Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the con			
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the			
,			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for fore	ign priority under 35 U.S.C. §	119(a)-(d) or (f).	
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:  1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents	ents have been received		
2. Certified copies of the priority docume		oplication No.	
3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the p	•	•	
application from the International Bur			
* See the attached detailed Office action for a	list of the certified copies not a	eceived.	
Attachment(s)			
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)		ummary (PTO-413) I/Mail Date	
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	5) 🔲 Notice of In	formal Patent Application	
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 11/03, 11/05	6) Other:	<b>-</b> •	

Art Unit: 1744

## **DETAILED ACTION**

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- 2. Claims 1-4, 7-10 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Japanese patent to Murata et al. (JP 5-192278, cited in IDS- abstract only).
- 3. The patent to Murata et al. discloses an electric blower 8 mounted in an electric blower chamber 9 for generating a suction air stream; a dust collecting unit 10 in a dust collecting chamber 11 for collecting dirt particles contained in the suction airstream, wherein the suction airstream passing through the dust collecting unit in the electric blower flows in an approximately linear path (see figure 1) and a dust removing unit 13,14 located in the dust collecting chamber acting on the dust collecting part for removing dirt particles adhered to the dust collecting unit. Murata et al. also disclose the electric blower chamber communicates with the dust collecting chamber through a communication hole (partition dividing dust collecting chamber and electric blower chamber), which is adjacent to the dust removing unit. The dust collecting part has a polyhedral configuration, when expanded by the airstream, and is made of a soft material.
- 4. Claims 1-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Takeda et al. (US 3,591,888, cited in IDS).

Art Unit: 1744

5. The patent to Takeda et al. discloses an electric blower 2 mounted in an electric blower chamber 1 for generating a suction air stream; a dust collecting unit 9 in a dust collecting chamber 8 for collecting dirt particles contained in the suction airstream, wherein the suction airstream passing through the dust collecting unit in the electric blower flows in an approximately linear path (see figure 2) and an air permeable dust removing unit 25' located in the dust collecting chamber acting on the dust collecting part for removing dirt particles adhered to the dust collecting unit. Takeda et al. also disclose the electric blower chamber communicates with the dust collecting chamber through a communication hole (in plate 26), which is adjacent to the dust removing unit.

- 6. Claims 1-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Kato et al. (US 3,841,067).
- 7. The patent to Kato et al. discloses an electric blower 16 mounted in an electric blower chamber 10 for generating a suction air stream; a dust collecting unit 30 in a dust collecting chamber 20 for collecting dirt particles contained in the suction airstream, wherein the suction airstream passing through the dust collecting unit in the electric blower flows in an approximately linear path (see figure 1) and a dust removing unit 50-54 located in the dust collecting chamber acting on the dust collecting part for removing dirt particles adhered to the dust collecting unit. Kato et al. also disclose the electric blower chamber communicates with the dust collecting chamber through a communication hole 40, which is adjacent to the dust removing unit and is considered to disclose the dust removing unit has an air permeability (hollow coiled spring) and is detachably connected to the dust removing unit, as the coiled spring appears friction fit over the support element 52.

Art Unit: 1744

# Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 9. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* v. *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:
  - 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
  - 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
  - 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
  - 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.
- 10. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).
- 11. Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Japanese patent to Murata et al. (JP 5-192278, cited in IDS- abstract only) in view of Steiner et al. (US 5,035,024).

Art Unit: 1744

12. The patent to Murata et al. discloses all the recited subject matter with exception of at least one portion of the main body being transparent or translucent. The patent to Steiner et al. discloses a hand-held vacuum in which the dust collection unit 7 is made of a transparent plastic resin. It would have been obvious to a person skilled in the art to modify the main body (canister) of Murata et al. to be transparent so that the user can see the amount of debris collected by the vacuum cleaner (see Steiner et al., column 5, lines 40-45).

### Allowable Subject Matter

- 13. Claims 12-14 are allowed.
- 14. The following is an examiner's statement of reasons for allowance: With respect to claim 12, the prior art does not disclose the claimed combination, particularly an indication unit including a light display unit indicating an operation state of the dust removing unit. Most of the prior art is mechanically moved and would not allow for a light display unit. The other prior art that uses electromagnetic vibration also does not suggest employing a light display unit.

Any comments considered necessary by applicant must be submitted no later than the payment of the issue fee and, to avoid processing delays, should preferably accompany the issue fee. Such submissions should be clearly labeled "Comments on Statement of Reasons for Allowance."

#### Conclusion

15. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. The patents to Miyake et al., McClure and European patent to Steckman disclose other filter cleaning devices.

Art Unit: 1744

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Terrence R. Till whose telephone number is (571) 272-1280. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon. through Thurs. and every other Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gladys P. Corcoran can be reached on (571) 272-1214. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1744

trt